

E 713

R 52

1898

98
E 713
.R52
Copy 1

J. D. Richardson 5.000

M. F. R.

HAWAIIAN ANNEXATION AND OUR
FOREIGN POLICY.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES D. RICHARDSON,
OF TENNESSEE,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 14, 1898.

WASHINGTON.

1898.

H. P. S.

F
Mr. H. A. Smith

68571

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES D. RICHARDSON.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. Res. 259) to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States—

Mr. RICHARDSON said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The proposition to annex the Sandwich Islands to the United States, with or without the consent of their population, meets with my unqualified and unalterable opposition. I am also opposed to the permanent conquest and acquisition of Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and all other isles of the sea. Nations have always acted, and should govern themselves at all times, upon principles entirely different from those which actuate individuals. I admit that individuals do, and should oftentimes, act for the good of others regardless to a greater or lesser extent of the result of their action on themselves. But this is not true of nations.

Governments must base their action upon purely selfish considerations. In looking at the question of the annexation of Hawaii, or of any foreign territory, the only question that should enter into consideration by us is the one question: Is it best for the United States? The weal or woe, the misery or happiness, the poverty or prosperity of the foreigner or those to be annexed is not involved, and not to be considered in making up our minds as to the annexation of foreign territory.

I am so devout and devoted a lover of my own country that I admit without a moment's hesitation that there is no territory remote from or lying near by us that would not be better off in most if not all its conditions by annexation to and by becoming amalgamated with ours. The superiority of our institutions and the excellence of our form of government, which to my mind is the world's ideal, place this matter beyond peradventure or dispute.

The chief question, then, involved in the resolution before us to decide is, Shall we for our own benefit annex the Sandwich Islands? The laboring oar in this contention and in the effort to answer this interrogatory in the affirmative is upon those who favor the passage of the pending measure. The procedure or plan of annexation is of doubtful constitutionality and involves fundamental principles. The annexation of Hawaii and the acquisition of far-away colonies involves a permanent policy that is far-reaching and of paramount importance to this Republic. It is, in my judgment, in palpable violation of all our traditions and our past conduct.

We have not only not heretofore entered upon a policy of the acquisition of foreign territory and of outlying colonies from

which we are separated by seas and oceans, but, on the contrary, we have persistently and uniformly maintained a different policy. We have been demonstrative and aggressive in the pursuit of our policy. At the very outset of our existence as a nation the greatest of our great and the wisest of our wise men earnestly and eloquently advocated the policy we have pursued. The policy of this Government in respect to this matter, and indeed of all foreign questions, was laid down in the beginning by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, each of whom, in terms which can not be misunderstood, warned us of the dangers of foreign complications, of entangling alliances with other nations, and of annexing territory beyond the sea.

For more than a century the policy so firmly established by these great men has been pursued with unbroken harmony, has proved a bulwark of strength to our own people, and at the same time has won for us the respect and admiration of the world. For one I shall not violate this policy and advocate another which to my mind is so un-American, unwise, and fraught with so much danger to the Republic. I will not make a complete departure from the safe course we have followed so long and so profitably.

I am opposed to the new policy provided in the pending measure because it is plainly in contravention of the Monroe doctrine. We can not as an enlightened people say to all the nations of the earth, "You shall not extend your possessions on this hemisphere," and at the same time reach out ourselves for lands and colonies in theirs.

Mr. BERRY. I desire to ask the gentleman a question right here, because he is conversant with the Monroe doctrine. Does he say that the Monroe doctrine prohibits us from taking as a part of our country an island 2,000 miles from our shores and 4,000 miles from the nearest point of the Eastern Continent? Might not that island be more properly the property of the United States than of any country that lies beyond the seas?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Is it not in the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not understand that the fact that Hawaii may be nearer to us than to any other country will interfere with or prevent the application of the Monroe doctrine. That doctrine in essence and spirit forbids our going out into the sea and the ocean to acquire territory.

Mr. TAWNEY. Did we not do that in the Alaska purchase?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will come to that in a moment. The case which the gentleman mentions is not parallel with this.

Mr. TAWNEY. Have we not done it in the case of fifty-seven islands which we have annexed, exclusive of the Aleutian Islands?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think not. Though separated in some degree, like the Florida reefs from Florida or the Aleutian Islands from Alaska, they are part and parcel of the territory annexed; and if we have annexed others of a different character it has been for mere coaling stations, or something of that kind.

Mr. TAWNEY. The fifty-seven islands that I referred to are exclusive of the Aleutian Islands and in no way connected with the Alaska purchase.

Mr. RICHARDSON. They have not been annexed in the sense in which we propose to annex Hawaii. I will come to that point, I think, a little further on.

Mr. TAWNEY. The island of Midway, a part of the Hawaiian group, is certainly an analogous case.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If we are to demand of other nations that they keep their hands off American colonies and not intermeddle with American affairs, it certainly behooves us, nay, it is imperatively required of us, to set them the example by refraining from intermeddling with the affairs of Europe, in the Orient, and elsewhere. I am a firm believer in the Monroe doctrine in all its force and consequences. I would not modify it at all, and for this reason I would not invite its violation in letter or spirit by other nations by our attempting the conquest of territory beyond the seas.

If I believed or could be convinced that such conquest and acquisition were essential to our longer existence as a free and independent people, I might hold a different opinion. If I believed that such a course contributed even remotely to our happiness and prosperity, I might entertain the abandonment of the views I am expressing. But, sir, a departure from the course we have pursued under the guidance and inspiration of the fathers is not demanded for our happiness as a people, and, in my judgment, instead of bringing increased prosperity and blessings to our country, will entail upon us decay and disaster, and finally dissolution and death. I know it is claimed, in the consideration of this measure to annex Hawaii, that the acquisition of Cuba, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and other colonies is not necessarily involved and should not be taken into consideration. If gentlemen are honest and sincere in this contention, they will not hesitate to support an amendment to the measure annexing Hawaii which I shall offer at the proper time, if no other gentleman does, declaring that a colonial policy is not to be entered upon and that acquisitions are to stop with Hawaii.

But, sir, this measure is but the forerunner of others. It is the beginning of a new policy on our part. The boldest, if not the discreetest, of its advocates admit this. If the question stood by itself and did not involve other conquests or acquisitions, I should oppose it then as unwise. It is claimed that the annexation of Hawaii would strengthen the strategic position of the United States by giving us a great naval advantage; that, is the command of the eastern Pacific Ocean, thereby protecting our western coast. This contention must fail, as all will admit who listened attentively to the able argument of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] on this point. But supposing this were admitted in a partial sense; what protection do we need that the possession of Hawaii would afford?

In our present condition we do not need any such protection. It is only after we shall have entered upon the policy of conquest and annexation of outlying colonies that it can be truly said we need such protection. I concede if we are to change our policy and enter upon that of colony and land grabbing as a nation, then we should need Hawaii and other remote islands and colonies. The acquisition of one creates at once the demand and a necessity which becomes urgent for others. When we start out on this new policy, we can not stop with the acquisition of one, but must go on until we absorb all.

Let us enter upon such a policy and get our appetite once whetted in that direction, there will be no way of satisfying that appetite until all the isles of the sea have been engulfed by us. Then our foreign complications will multiply beyond computation and war will ensue. Indeed we should not emerge from one war before we would be plunged into another, until our Republic, which has

hitherto loved peace and the ways thereof, will become the bully of the world and the despised of all peoples.

I do not mean to disparage or put in question our ability to fight successfully all the world if they only come to our shores and fight us upon our chosen ground. We might do this by reason of our inexhaustible resources, indomitable courage, and unfaltering patriotism. But why provoke such a stupendous controversy? Can it be supposed that we can with one breath forbid all other nations (many of them of great power and fighting ability) to enter upon this hemisphere for any purpose whatever, and at once ourselves enter upon the conquest or acquisition of or even interference with provinces in the Eastern Hemisphere or elsewhere? The position of this Republic has always been that of concentration and not diffusion.

Our policy has been to foster and build up the nation as a land power in contradistinction to sea power. Our position among nations is unique. No reason exists for a change in our policy. By its pursuit we have won and have held the esteem and the admiration of the world. We should not be beguiled now by the glamour of conquest or the excitement of the hour engendered in a large degree by a recent great naval victory in a distant sea to abandon our well-chosen position. So long as we pursue the policies of the fathers and founders of the Republic and adhere to the practices of the hundred years of the past which they bequeathed to us, and which have brought us unparalleled prosperity and unalloyed happiness, we need no protection for the Pacific coast other than that which God has given us.

Our position on our western coast and as a nation at large is exceptionally strong. We have no insular territories to defend. All our possessions are on our own continent, and, with the exception of Alaska, all is continuous land territory. No navy of the world nor the combined navies of all nations can cut us off from our possessions. Our vast area and limits, with our opportunities for defense, stand as impassable barriers to invasions from any part of our coast.

Washington, in discussing our relations with foreign countries and reviewing subjects closely akin to the one involved in the pending resolution in his Farewell Address to the people of the United States, uttered words which I shall presently quote of unsurpassed wisdom. I would rejoice to-day if they could be read and understood in all their force, power, and beauty by all of our people everywhere. The following are his words:

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient Government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that

of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

Again Mr. Jefferson taught us that the true doctrine was and is:

Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman will allow me to ask whether if we should acquire these islands it will not necessitate our building and continuing to build a larger navy.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; I will come to that point directly.

Mr. Speaker, President Washington, it seems to me, could see as if with the natural eye our present situation.

Sir, we want no islands away out in the sea which can in a few days at any stage of our existence become the prey of hostile navies. The other great powers of the world, England, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain, indeed, all the great nations, except, possibly, Russia, have such colonies and islands to defend; and while no one can truthfully say that the United States could not successfully defend them, if she had them, it is the unwisdom of the policy of seizing and annexing them I am attempting to demonstrate.

I am opposed to the new policy for another reason. It involves the building of a mighty navy and the maintenance of a standing army at all times of stupendous proportions and magnitude. These two things will be absolutely necessary for the respectable enforcement of the new order of things. Why should we incur the enormous expense of a great navy for the Atlantic Ocean, another for the Gulf of Mexico, and a third for the Pacific Ocean? A corresponding increase will be required for a standing army.

Mr. Speaker, we have had enough of war and of the expenditures incident thereto. As a nation we are now, year by year, and every year, paying a tribute to war of \$150,000,000 in the form of pensions alone. I fail to see in the near future any hope for a reduction on this account. On the other hand, the war with Spain in which we are engaged is to add how much no one can tell to our pension roll. In addition to this immense sum, we are also paying as a further annual tribute in the shape of interest on our public debt about \$35,000,000 and to a sinking fund for its retirement the further sum of about \$51,000,000.

Why, then, should we incur the additional expenses for great armies and navies? They serve to provoke war sometimes when without them war could be avoided with honor. Enter upon the new policy I am discussing and add to our present enormous expenses the still greater and more oppressive expenditures incident thereto, and we will lay excessive burdens on our people which will be without a parallel in their history. For one, representing a constituency as proud, patriotic, and intelligent as any represented on this floor, I will not give my voice and vote to any measure or policy which in my judgment will create the necessity and lay the foundations for the fearful and extravagant expenditures to which I have referred. No nation prior to this period has sought or desired a conflict of arms with the United States.

If nations act upon the principle I mentioned at the outset of my remarks—that is, that they govern themselves in their course and conduct toward other nations upon selfish grounds—why should they desire war with us? What could any nation gain by such a conflict of arms? All great powers realize that they have more to lose than to gain by war with us. Then let us not provoke them to attack us, but go on for all ages to come, growing in prosperity as the years and decades and even centuries go by.

adding each year to the sum of human happiness by giving our people the freest, the best, and most prosperous Government on the globe.

The other great nations I have mentioned have their outlying colonies, and must maintain their powerful armies and navies, for the support of which excessive burdens in the shape of taxes are annually laid upon their people. Let us not grind the faces of our people by exorbitant taxation and make ourselves weak by enforcing a policy of colonial possessions.

Gentlemen in their stress for plausible arguments upon which to place their advocacy of the annexation policy they now favor have referred to the former acquisitions of territory by our beloved country. They cite the Louisiana purchase by Jefferson, and the annexation of Texas, with the acquisitions of the Californias, etc., by Polk, and of the Floridas by Monroe. These, sir, are not parallel cases to the proposition we are now discussing. If Hawaii or the Philippines touched California, or Cuba touched Florida, there might be plausibility in such arguments and comparisons. The former acquisitions by us of territory meant no change in our land or sea policy, no increase of our Army or Navy, no abandonment of the Monroe doctrine, and no entangling alliances with foreign peoples and courts.

These acquisitions were almost or quite essential to our existence as a republic. It is shocking to compare the annexation of Hawaii with the acquisition of the Louisiana territory alone, to say nothing of Texas and the Californias. I resent the comparison as one totally unworthy to be made. Mr. Blaine, in his great book, speaking of the acquisition of the Louisiana territory by Mr. Jefferson, said:

It brought incalculable wealth, power, and prestige to the Union, and must always be regarded as the master stroke of policy which advanced the United States from a comparatively feeble nation lying between the Atlantic Ocean and the Mississippi River to a continental power of assured strength and boundless promise.

Mr. Speaker, this was the largest conquest of territory ever achieved without war. The cost was only about \$15,000,000, a sum which does not equal the revenue which is collected by the Government on its soil in a single month. The territory thus acquired was then, much of it—

A solitude of vast extent, untouched
By hand or art, where nature sowed herself
And reaped her crops.

This territory to-day comprises the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, and Montana, nearly all of Minnesota, a portion of Colorado, and the Indian Territory. Reasonable and fair-minded men should not cite this as a precedent for the annexation of Hawaii. Let us look for a moment from that picture to the other. What do we get when we annex Hawaii? According to the census of 1896 the population of these islands consisted of the following elements (omitting some of the smallest):

Population.	Number.	Population.	Number.
Hawaiians (pure and mixed)	39,504	Americans	3,080
Japanese	25,407	British	2,250
Chinese	21,616	Germans	1,432
Portuguese	15,291		

It will be seen that in a population of about 109,000 only 3,080 are Americans, 2,250 British, and 1,432 Germans, the remainder, about fifteen-sixteenths, or nearly 16 to 1, being Japanese, Chinese, Portuguese, and natives of the Sandwich Islands, wholly unfit for free representative or local self-government.

The advocates of the annexation of Hawaii have not told us what we shall do with it after we get it. That is to say, they do not agree in their conclusions on this point. The able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. HITT, failed and refused to tell us, when pointedly asked to do so, in his opening speech. He frankly admitted he did not know. Is it to become a State of the American Union? Heaven forbid! Two Senators in the other body and one Representative upon this floor from the free and sovereign State of Hawaii! Three more votes in the electoral college, enough sometimes to settle the Presidency! May we be spared such a travesty on our politics and institutions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman from Tennessee will allow me to remind him that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], one of the most zealous advocates of annexation, said a few moments ago in the course of some very carefully prepared remarks: "I scorn to discuss what is to come from this annexation." That is the kind of statesmanship we are invited to follow—a statesmanship that does not see an inch ahead of its nose.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is true.

If it is not to become a State, what then shall we do with it? Shall it be held permanently as a Territory? Will it be contended that the inhabitants of those islands can govern themselves by and through a Territorial legislature? No one will make such a claim.

Mr. BERRY. The gentleman will allow me to remind him that the treaty with reference to annexation provides that there shall be three commissioners representing this country and two representing the Hawaiian Islands, who shall recommend measures to be passed upon by the Congress of the United States for the future government of the territory which we acquire. It is possible that in these two bodies there might be found wisdom enough to govern these islands.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman has anticipated a point to which I will come in a moment. We know that the attitude of a Territory with us has always been one of expectation and hope. Expectation and hope that it would soon be permitted to take upon itself the form, conditions, and responsibilities of a proud and equal State in the American Union. There is no reasonable hope that by time or circumstance the conditions in Hawaii will so radically and materially change and improve as to render the inhabitants thereof qualified to become citizens of a sovereign State.

A hot sun, the tropical climate, the rough, barren, mountainous lands of a large portion of the islands, not to enlarge upon the fatal plague which unhappily afflicts them, all forbid their general occupation and tillage by our people. It seems to me they must inevitably remain the heritage of the Sandwich Islander, the Asiatic races, and half-breeds who can never approach to our American civilization nor partake of nor participate in our American institutions.

The only form of government then left for them would be a board or commission of some kind, appointed by the President of the United States to manage and control the affairs of the islands.

These boards would vary and change as Administrations come and go with us. They would not be permanent, and, if they were, would be utterly and entirely in contravention of our laws and institutions, which are rooted and grounded on the principles of equality and self-government.

I oppose annexation again in the interest of labor and the laboring classes of our people. We have been enacting immigration laws for the protection of our homes. Congress has exhausted its resources in the efforts to pass wise measures prohibiting certain classes by reason of their poverty, their ignorance, or diseased conditions from entering our ports and coming in competition with our laborers and demoralizing our people. By the proposed measure we annex the very classes we have sought to exclude by legislation from our shores.

It is the supremest folly in Congress to formulate legislative anathemas against undesirable immigration from Europe and close the Pacific coast, and, indeed, all ways of ingress to our country, to the Chinese, and then in one act admit nearly 80,000 Chinese, Japanese, and Hawaiians to become a part of our population. We will probably by this act admit more Chinese than San Francisco now contains, besides many other obnoxious and objectionable foreigners.

Mr. BERRY. Permit me to say that the treaty which we have been negotiating provides that no citizen of China and no native of the islands shall by reason of annexation become a citizen of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. We are not considering their citizenship, but their presence.

Mr. BERRY. But the gentleman from Tennessee is arguing that they are to be admitted as citizens.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman from Kentucky say that any treaty with those people is above the Constitution?

Mr. BERRY. You have now laws upon your statute books prohibiting Chinamen from becoming citizens of this country, and that provision is only reasserted in the constitution of that country.

Mr. BLAND. The constitution makes every native of that island a citizen.

Mr. BERRY. Yes, but you have done away with that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The trouble is that we undertake to annex to our country and make a part of it a population that can not come among us and be a part of us; and that is really inconsistent with the idea of our Government under our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I desire to say, in my opinion, it is monstrous to contemplate the evil effects upon the laboring people of our land and upon the American farmer if this Government embarks upon the plan of imperial colonization.

The cheap cool labor of the tropical colonies we would acquire, directed and managed by competent hands, and their products manipulated by world-wide trusts would close up all our sugar industries, both of cane and beets, destroy our tobacco growing and tobacco manufacture, and so cheapen our Southern products of cotton, rice, hemp, and all fiber crops, by the competition and increased production in the East and West Indies, and other tropical colonies as to forever destroy these industries in the United States. We have been forced to endure prices below the cost of the production of nearly all of these commodities for years past under a high protective tariff system, but these former low prices would be prosperity itself as compared with those which would obtain under the new system.

It is contended by some persons that we must enter upon the policy of annexation in order to extend our commerce and to plant our flag in all harbors. In order to do this they say we must of necessity change our former course and conduct and must possess a powerful navy. I grant you it is desirable to widen our markets and extend our trade with other nations. They say, and truthfully, that commerce follows the flag. But let me ask, how are we to inaugurate and pursue this new policy successfully unless we abandon that old policy which its advocates proudly denominate the American policy, a policy which we have heretofore pursued and which is altogether at variance with the proposed new one?

It is all very well to talk of commerce following the flag and of sending our merchant ships abroad until their sails whiten every sea. This is a consummation devoutly to be wished. But I submit we can not hold fast to the policy of a high protective tariff and at the same time whiten every sea with the sails of our merchantmen. Commerce will never follow very enthusiastically the flag of that nation which hedges itself in as by a Chinese Wall with high protective tariff rates and schedules. We can not expect nations and peoples to come to us to buy when by law we forbid them to bring something to sell to us. And thus we find again that the friends and advocates of the new policy are confronted with another insurmountable obstacle.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, if it is along the line of what I am talking about.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does not the gentleman think that the experience of this year, when our exports will exceed our imports by \$600,000,000, disputes his proposition and disproves it?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; I do not think that at all. The gentleman is speaking of present conditions, while I am speaking of and attempting to depict the future condition which will be brought about by reason of the new policy, which I am attempting to show is unwise.

Mr. HEPBURN. The condition of a protective tariff exists now, and the exports this year exceed the imports by \$600,000,000.

Mr. BERRY. That is on account of the exportation of wheat.

Mr. GAINES. Hungry Europe did that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That may be for some reason which I am not going to discuss now, but the conditions will materially change then, and if they are at all prosperous now, they will fail to be under the new policy which I am attempting to describe. Mr. Speaker, unless they can batter down and demolish the hitherto impregnable fortress of protection their contention in favor of annexation and an increase in our Navy, to the end that our commerce may be extended and our markets increased, must fail.

I heard a distinguished member of this House in a public speech a few days ago say we had already entered upon the new era, that our time-honored policy had been abandoned, and that henceforth we were to acquire and permanently hold colonies everywhere. This thought, too, was liberally applauded by his audience. Like the commercial firm in the well-known play of the "Gilded Fool," we are "to progress," we are "to reach out." I do not subscribe to this doctrine. I deny that that is to be our policy.

What, sir, was the first solemn declaration made by this Con-

gress, and which was approved by the Chief Executive of the nation, when we entered upon the present war a little over thirty days gone by? In declaring war we announced openly to all the world a wholly different course of conduct. That policy we then avowed with emphasis and unanimity is contained in the resolution I now quote, and which forms a part of our solemn declaration as we took up arms and made our appeal to Him who controls the destiny of nations. It is as follows:

Resolved, That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island [meaning the Island of Cuba] except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Mr. Speaker, many of us thought and undertook to teach our people that when our Government, speaking through its representatives, solemnly gave this pledge to all mankind we were honest and sincere; that when she drew her sword and unfurled her flag in this contest, it was to wage a holy war (if war can ever be holy) for humanity. It was not supposed it was to degenerate into a campaign of conquest or boodle.

During this entire controversy Spain, our adversary, through her statesmen and public journals, has persistently charged that the sole object of the war on our part was not humanity, but that we were bent on despoiling her of her territory. We have denied it. Shall we by our own action now or hereafter prove that her allegations were true and that our own were false? If we are to be justified at all before the world for our part in this terrible war, for all war is terrible, let us not take advantage of the situation to add one foot of territory to our now already ample domain.

Let us demonstrate not only to Spain but to all the world that the people of the United States had but one object and purpose in this great controversy, and that was and is to see that justice is done even though the heavens fall. Let Cuba be made free and Spain removed with all her mediæval cruelties and atrocious crimes from this hemisphere, and then the only purpose we have or can have in this war will have been accomplished.

Mr. Frederic R. Conder, who is a recognized authority on international questions, was asked his views on the subject I am discussing, a few days ago. I take the liberty of quoting here what he said, for he expresses the opinion of many thinking men in our country. He said:

In a very few words I can tell you what, in my opinion, the United States should do with the Philippine Islands—

In the first place, Rear-Admiral Dewey should blow up the fortifications, turn the islands over to the insurgents, and then sail with his fleet for home. The insurgents are the ones to settle all questions as to the future government of the archipelago, and we should put them in a position to do so, and then leave them alone.

We started to accomplish one single, declared, definite object, a most noble one, based purely on humanitarian grounds. Our sincerity in our philanthropic professions is the only possible excuse for the war. To maintain good faith and our reputation with the rest of the world is worth a dozen Philippines and millions of coolies, Chinamen, and Malays.

We may count upon the sympathy of Europe so long as we adhere to our programme as deliberately set forth to the entire world. We can only depend upon jealousy and distrust if we depart from it. We told Spain she must leave Cuba. The war was entered upon to drive her from the island. That was our declared object, and we should do all that is properly necessary under the laws of war for the purpose without departure from that object.

I quote the following from the American Agriculturist:

The policy of colonial expansion, now so extravagantly urged in interested quarters, may not at present contemplate interference in European politics,

but such interference would be less a departure from the new policy than this policy is a departure from the Monroe doctrine. The new idea sounds very grand at first, and in the flush of victory the appeal to extend our domination beyond the seas is so alluring that the consequences of such action are lost sight of.

The policy of colonial empire would at once expose us to embroilment with other nations. It would vastly magnify the power and expense of Army and Navy. It would perpetuate increased taxes. It would inaugurate an era of corruption in our foreign possessions, a debasement of the blood, that could not fail to in time affect the physical and mental stamina of our people at home. It would be un-American, unwise, unconstitutional, and in results unworthy of the effort.

On still higher ground a colonial policy is objectionable. It would degenerate the holiest war ever waged for humanity into a campaign of conquest. This would lower the United States before the world, but its moral effect upon our own people would be still worse.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] in his opening remarks quoted Hon. John Sherman, as he gave his opinion in his great book a few years since, as to the conquest or acquisition of foreign territory. He showed that Mr. Sherman in his palmy days opposed such a policy. I now quote here from a recent interview with him published in the St. Louis Republic of May 29. This interview shows he is still opposed to conquest of territory. On the subject of the war he was asked:

"Will it become a war of conquest?" He replied:

"Certainly not. We want neither the Philippines nor Cuba. We want no foreign outposts which we will have to defend with our ships. We do not want to be constantly in trouble with France, Germany, and possibly England. This is a self-contained nation. It has limitless resources in itself. It wants no entanglements with foreign nations. It wants to keep them off its shores and it wants to keep off theirs. Our trade treaties with every civilized nation on the globe are sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, I could quote other eminent authorities, but time and space will not permit.

There may be something alluring in a policy of annexation and conquest of territory. An individual naturally feels as if he were adding riches and wealth to himself when he acquires lands and tenements. This is true of a nation under some circumstances. There are no colonies or possessions open to us, however, the acquisition of which would add to our wealth. We should not then demoralize our people by a departure from our uniform course of action for more than a century and that which I have just shown was our avowed policy at the outset of our impending war with Spain.

If we "reach out," as we are advised by some to do, and expand our policies and rule of action, we will assuredly neglect our domestic interests. Our Army and Navy will be increased, our foreign policy will be developed, our interest in other nations will be enhanced, but our home interests, which vitally concern and deeply affect all our home people, will be neglected or abandoned. Let us give more careful and serious attention to our internal affairs and foster and develop our home concerns.

Let us strive to give our people better educational opportunities, a better banking system, more mail facilities, free deliveries and cheaper postage, better roads, improved waterways, better protection against monopolies, better laws to control corporate greed and extortion, better laws for the regulation of trusts, better laws for the distribution of the currency, and impose lighter burdens of taxation upon the country, and, in short, the reform of all existing abuses. We do not want the enemies of social progress and of good government to hold high carnival at home while National and State legislatures are entirely engrossed concerning themselves with our newly acquired wards, many of them much

"off in color," in far-away colonies, and with our business relations with foreign nations.

Again, Mr. Speaker, if the era of territorial pelf and pillage has begun with us as a nation, and we are to start out for more territory and greater landed possessions, we should not begin the attack upon a poor, weak, and half-civilized nation, such as Spain. As a brave, courageous, and self-respecting people, we should commence this warfare with some government that ranks in the first class in the family of nations. For our country to seize the colonies of Spain for permanent use and occupation would place us on a par in our action with that of the giant who robs a dwarf or a big boy among school children despoiling the small boy of his favorite marbles.

As a brave and powerful people, if we are really in need of other lands and must have them, we should either buy them and pay for them or should say to Great Britain, "You must withdraw from this continent." Why not say to her that we need Canada and intend to have that country? This would be the manly thing to do and would give us contiguous territory of great value and resources. If a change of policy is determined upon and we must of necessity rob somebody, why not attack Great Britain, a member of our class, and proceed to take that which is valuable and worth possessing? Do not despoil the weak by seizing that which is worthless, and degrade and dishonor ourselves in the act.

Mr. Speaker, as I am about to close, allow me to sum up briefly something of what the new policy means:

1. It means the abandonment of the Monroe doctrine, a doctrine which is the guiding star of the Western Hemisphere, and next to the Constitution itself has been the greatest blessing to our land.

2. It means the abandonment of economy and simple government, which Jefferson, the father of Democracy, said was a landmark thereof.

3. It means immense standing armies and powerful navies.

4. It means the admission of undesirable foreigners into our midst to corrupt our body politic and impair true American institutions.

5. It means the magnifying of the National Government and national power, as against local and State authority. It is centralization itself.

6. It means colonies abroad of foreign tongues and nationalities ruled by military satraps instead of self-governing States in harmony with republican institutions.

7. It means the neglect and consequent decay of our local home governments and domestic concerns, the bulwarks of our strength and glory in the past.

8. It means odious entangling alliances with other nations.

9. It means wars on land and wars on the sea.

10. It means the downfall of the protective system and the first step in the march toward free trade.

11. It means a very large falling off in revenues from tariff duties and a correspondingly large increase in internal taxes, which so much impoverish the country and vex the taxpayer.

12. It means the destruction of the American farmer, that happy and independent class who have always been the peculiar pride of our beloved and favored land.

These are some of the things which will inevitably follow the new policy.

Mr. Speaker, we need no additional territory. Our domain is now ample and sufficient. We have an area exclusive of Alaska of 3,025,600 square miles, and including Alaska of 3,557,000 square miles. We have existed as a Republic something over one hundred years. Our development has been marvelous and our prosperity unprecedented. We have now a population of 70,000,000 of people and can easily accommodate 500,000,000.

We have a climate varied and temperate, in which flourish abundant crops of all the cereals, as well as the tropical fruits; broad acres which in fertility rival those of the famed banks of the Nile; mineral resources comprising in part gold, silver, iron, coal, lead, copper, zinc, etc., which are inexhaustible in supply; railroads, telegraph, telephone, and all other improvements which annihilate time and space, unequalled by any; the grandest lakes and the mightiest rivers; a civilization which is unsurpassed; and have more newspapers and better ones to disseminate the news and elevate public thought; more churches in which to worship the true and living God; more manufactories in which are produced more than three-fifths of the manufactured products of the world; more schoolhouses in which the youth of our land is educated and trained for life's battles; more happy homes, and, in short, in every conceivable fashion we have more to bless our lands and people than any nation on this globe.

Let us, then, be content with that which we have. We should hold fast to the old and good, and strive not for the new and the bad. And supremest and above all else, our people North, South, East, and West, from ocean to ocean and from the pines of the North to the magnolias of the South, are once more lovingly united. All sectional animosities have been dissipated, a new era of peace and good will among men has been inaugurated—

And all the clouds that lower'd upon our house,
In the deep bosom of the ocean buried.

Henceforth and forever we are to be one people—one in mind, one in sentiment, one in patriotic endeavor, one in our hopes and aspirations, one in all that make a nation great, one in all that make a free people contented, prosperous, and happy.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 717 918 0

